DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 354 TM 005 336

AUTHOR Alvir, Howard P.
TITLE Evaluation of Regional Workshops in Occupational Education: Evaluation Forms, Evaluation Plans, Evaluation Designs.
NOTE 31p.
AVAILABLE FROM Howard P. Alvir, 27 Norwood street, Albany, New York 12203 (on loan)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Methods; *Formative Evaluation; *Health Occupations Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; Questionnaires; Statistical Analysis; *Teacher Workshops; Training Objectives

ABSTRACT

The objectives of these evaluations include assessment of six health occupations regional workshops and the field testing of new evaluation instruments. In addition to being evaluated by participants and by observers, each of these workshops used a preplanning assessment form to sample a small number of prospective participants for typical needs. Evaluation designs are presented here, along with an explanation of the responsibilities of the workshop director and of the external evaluator. (BW)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128354

TITLE

EVALUATION OF REGIONAL WORKSHOPS IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

EVALUATION FORMS

EVALUATION PLANS

EVALUATION DESIGNS

TM

AUTHOR

Howard P. ALVIR, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The opinions expressed herein are representative of a personal viewpoint, and not of an institutional affiliation.

For loan copies, send a stamped, self-addressed envelope to :

Howard P. ALVIR, Ph.D.
27 Norwood Street
Albany, New York 12203

NO INSTITUTIONAL SPONSORSHIP CLAIMED.

TM005 336

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

INTRODUCTION---------- ii

FOR THE READER IN A HURRY---------- 1

PREASSESSMENT, OBJECTIVES, AND EVALUATION ITEMS---------- 3

PREASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION---------- 4

HOE-PPF (PART): PARTICIPANT---------- 6
HOE-PPF (NEEDS): PROGRAM NEEDS---------- 7
HOE-OBJ (OBJ): SAMPLE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES---------- 9

PROPOSED PLAN FOR EVALUATING SIX HOE REGIONAL CONFERENCES SPONSORED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGES---------- 10

PERSONNEL INVOLVED---------- 11
EVALUATION MANDATE---------- 11
INSTRUMENTATION---------- 12
TIMETABLES---------- 13
DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES---------- 13

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONFERENCE DIRECTOR---------- 15

INSERVICE WORKSHOPS EVALUATION DESIGN---------- 19

WORKSHOP DIRECTOR---------- 21
EXTERNAL EVALUATOR---------- 21
DEVELOP WORKSHOP PLANS---------- 22
APPROVE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT---------- 22
ANALYZE BENEFITS---------- 23
CORRELATE EVALUATION ITEMS AND BENEFITS---------- 24
CORRELATE SAMPLING INSTRUMENT WITH WORKSHOP EVALUATION INSTRUMENT---------- 25
SAMPLE RESULTS---------- 26
SAMPLE EVALUATION POSSIBILITIES---------- 27

Introduction

In setting up a preassessment system for educators, it is usual to find many comments about the helpfulness and competency of individual state personnel. Sometimes, this praise is placed in the perspective of success in spite of bureaucratic rules.

The tendency to focus on individuals can reflect an inability to cite specific strengths in an organization as a support system. However, any praise and recognition given to individual members reveals that the support system has done a good job in assembling a strong professional staff. These strong individuals can be tied together by an effective organization.

There is nothing original in the above thoughts. Many reports and magazine articles have made the same points previously.

The objective of this document is to provide a sound conceptual basis for agencies that wish to provide support systems designed to preassess needs of prospective participants in regional workshops.

In addition to conceptualization, the forms and plans contained in this document provide an example of successful implementation.

Since it must never be forgotten that formative evaluation is similar to the process we call evolution, the actual implementation steps in this document are always open to revision and adaptation to meet local needs. This stress on <u>adaptability</u> to local needs is one step closer to <u>accountability</u> to sponsoring agencies.

FOR THE READER IN A HURRY

Evaluation of Health Occupations Education Regional Workshop

The objectives of these evaluations include assessment of six health occupations regional workshops and the fieldtesting of new inservice evaluation instruments.

Phase I of the evaluation includes tabulation of the evaluation results by the Division of Research.

Phase II includes the tabulation of the evaluation instruments, both for participants and for observers, by the workshop directors. These results will be reported to the appropriate funding agency.

Baseline Data:

In addition to the two instruments referred to, evaluation by participants and evaluation by observers, each of these workshops has used a pre-planning assessment form. The basis for this detailed form is called model one.

In the conceptual stage, it was assumed that a highly specific instrument could be mailed to all of the teachers concerned. From these detailed instruments, it was assumed that a consensus would develop as to the needs of the workshop.

After the operational research on the first three workshops, model one of evaluation has been revised into model two.

A. It is felt that a small limited sampling must be taken in order to come up with very specific questions that refer directly to the needs of the participants for a regional workshop.

B. These needs are to be refined into a questionnaire that can be sent to the general population of workshop candidates.

C. The results of this questionnaire should provide specific input as to what the participants perceive as needs.

At the present time, model two of pre-planning assessment cannot be investigated until the next round of workshops. The reason for this is simply that all six workshops were planned with the first model. Feedback from the participating workshops proved that model one forms become too cumbersome and ambiguous when the large population sampling is done without a more specific and concrete approach to the workshop pre-planning assessment.

In brief, it is necessary to sample a small number of prospective participants for typical needs. Once these needs have been mapped out in terms of the workshop, the entire population of teachers can participate by voting or by selecting important areas of concern. This type of validation seems to promise more relevant workshop planning.

Operational Objective:

It is anticipated that three workshops will complete the two forms, evaluation by participants and the evaluation by observers. It is anticipated further that each of these workshops will tabulate the results and report findings to the appropriate funding agency. It is anticipated that the data gathered in the last three workshops can be interpreted with as much success as was found in interpreting the data of the first three workshops.

In general, the first three workshops concluded that:

A. Workshop objectives must be presented in very specific terms to be understood by the prospective workshop candidate.

B. At the workshop, either by presenter explanation or by suggestions by participants, concrete examples must be given of how the workshop objectives can be applied in the classroom.

C. The transition of teacher competencies acquired at the workshop to learner benefits according to individuals taught by workshop participants is not an easy one. This transition must be fostered by constant repetition, frequent opportunities for practice, and voluntary feedback from workshop participants.

PREASSESSMENT, OBJECTIVES, AND EVALUATION ITEMS

Preassessment

A standardized preassessment form has been developed.

This form was developed in cooperation with representatives of post-secondary health occupations education programs.

This preassessment can be developed by looking at the samples provided in the section entitled PREASSESSMENT DOCUMENTATION.

Objectives

The objectives are to be developed by the workshop director.

The objectives are to be approved by the state agencies sponsoring the workshop or conference.

The state agency will look at the workshops from two viewpoints:

1. Content: Do the workshops respond to the needs analysis?

2. Format: Are the workshops specific, practical, appropriate, measurable, and observable?

Once the objectives have passed through these two filters, measurement items will be developed for each objective. In general, at least two different types of measurement/evaluation items should be developed for each objective. This will provide for a variety of evaluation measures, instruments, techniques, means, and viewpoints. In this way, it can be determined whether or not the project, workshop, or conference has accomplished what it intended to accomplish.

Evaluation Items

Once the above has been done, it is possible to key each evaluation item to a specific objective.

This has another benefit. For each evaluation item, it can be determined beforehand what is understood by a positive or negative evaluation. Instead of coming up with global evaluation items that cannot be specificly diagnosed into remediable conference components, this evaluation comes up with a diagnostic evaluation individually designed for the specific needs and objectives of the conference.

P R E - A S S E S S M E N T
D O C U M E N T A T I O N

Cover Letter -- sample dated February 24, 1975

HOE-PPF (PART) -- Health Occupations Education Program Preassessemnt Form
(for Participants)

HOE-PPF (NEEDS) (page 1) -- HOE Program Preassessment Form
(for Program Needs)

HOE-PPF (NEEDS) (page 2) -- continuation from page 1

HOE-OBJ -- HOE Sample Conference Objectives

February 24, 1975

Enclosed please find three products resulting from the February 21, 1975 planning meeting for HOE Regional Conferences:

1. HOE-PPF (PART)
   HOE PROGRAM PREASSESSMENT FORM (FOR PARTICIPANTS)
2. HOE-PPF (NEEDS)
   HOE PROGRAM PREASSESSMENT FORM (FOR PROGRAM NEEDS)
3. HOE-OBJ
   HOE SAMPLE CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES

As agreed at the meeting, both HOE-PPF (PART) and HOE-PPF (NEEDS) are to be administered by all participating HOE regional conference directors. Individual colleges may add on to these program preassessment forms, but no college will delete any item.

As agreed at the meeting, each HOE regional conference director will distribute these forms to prospective participants. Each regional conference director will mail the tabulated results of the program preassessment forms before May 1, 1975 to:

Howard P. Alvir

HOE regional conference directors will use the results of the program preassessment forms in order to develop relevant conference objectives. These conference objectives will follow the format indicated on HOE SAMPLE CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES. This will stress workshop goals, participant (teacher) objectives, and student (high school, BOCES) objectives. Development of objectives in this threefold format is for the purpose of documenting that HOE regional conferences focused on changing teacher behavior do result in significant measurable increases in student achievement.

Sincerely yours,

Howard

Howard P. Alvir
Associate in Research

Encls.

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE:
Name
Address
City, State, Zip
School

HOE-PPF (PART)

HOE PROGRAM PREASSESSMENT FORM (for PARTICIPANTS)

HOE PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

DIRECTIONS: Place response in the space provided.

For multiple choice answers, circle the appropriate letter.

1. Social Security Number (optional before acceptance): _____

2. Title or Position: _____

3. Health Specialty (Professional Affiliation): _____

4. Area of Health Occupations Education Teaching:

   A. Dental Assisting
   B. Dental Laboratory Assisting
   C. Environmental Health Assisting
   D. Health Assisting (Including such locally used titles as Health Services, Health Careers, Introduction to Health Occupations, Health Core/Foundations, and Similar Titles)
   E. Home Health Assisting
   F. Medical Assisting
   G. Medical Laboratory Assisting
   H. Medical Therapy Assisting
   I. Mental Health Assisting
   J. Nurse's Assisting
   K. Practical Nursing
   L. Other; specify: _____

5. HOE Certification: (Use A to L as in 4 above).

   A. B. C. D. E. F. G. H. I. J. K. L.

6. Course(s) Taught/Responsible for: _____

   _____

   _____

7. Extent of Clinical Supervision Responsibilities:

   _____

8. Years of Health Experience: _____

9. Years of Teaching Experience: (specify levels) _____

10. Age Grouping of Person Responding:

    (A) 20-29; (B) 30-39; (C) 40-49; (D) 50 and above

HOE PROGRAM PREASSESSMENT FORM (for PROGRAM NEEDS)

HOE PROGRAM NEEDS ASSESSMENT

PART 1: COMMON CORE PREASSESSMENT

DIRECTIONS: Place responses in the spaces provided.

1. Where do you want the emphasis during the two day regional conference?

___ basic content
___ new concepts
___ teaching methods
___ job markets
___ career mobility
___ changing roles
___ other; specify in question 2

2. Specify any areas not mentioned above you would like covered if given the opportunity:

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

3. Nominate experts you would like to have on the conference faculty:

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

4. What sort of HOE facilities are available to you? (check all that apply)

___ classroom
___ clinical areas
___ classroom laboratory
___ learning laboratory
  ___ available
  ___ anticipated
___ AV equipment: specify _____
___ independent (individualized) study
___ innovative program; specify _____
___ other; specify _____

5. What is your average class size? _____

6. What population levels are taught in your HOE classes (Give percentages).

___% High School
___% Adult

7. What is the total enrollment in your HOE classes (Give numbers).

___ number of high school students
___ number of adult students

PART 2: LOCAL PREASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

8. Do you want overnight accommodations?

___ Yes

___ one night

___ two nights

___ No

9. What is your transportation: Mode of arrival? _____

10. Are you interested in planned evening activities?

___ Yes

___ cultural

___ recreational

___ conference related

___ No

SAMPLE HOE CONFERENCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Workshop Goal	Participant (Teacher) Objective	Student (HS, BOCES) Objective
This workshop intends to:	The participating teacher is able to:	Students taught by participating teachers can:
Identify changes and new developments	Specify market expectation (KO) Provide reality orientation (AO) (PO)	PINPOINT: Who can do what (PO) How exciting is the job (AO) How much brain work (KO) (independent decision making)
Stimulate more effective collaboration and use of community resources	Clear up ambiguities (KO) about job description Feel more secure (AO) Pinpoint the job market (PO) Prepare learners (PO) (a) in view of career opening (b) in line of expressed personal interests (AO)	Visualize actual "on the job" reality (KO) Simulate the fit of the career chosen (AO) Anticipate the chance to get a job where trained (PO)
Bring the handicapped into the mainstream of employment	Identify jobs where the handicapped are especially matched to job demands (KO) Demonstrate actual case histories of handicapped who cashed in on the handicapping conditions (PO)	Demonstrate how certain handicapping conditions are assets in certain jobs (AO) • microscopic study (immobilized) • no gossip, no phones (deaf) (lip read) • meticulous and monotonous (mental retarded) • tactile perception (blind) • from dictation to typing or computer keyboard (blind)
Articulate secondary with post-secondary level programming	Visit the actual campus laboratories and facilities (PO)	Receive first hand advice and counseling (AO)
	NOTE: KO = Knowledge Objectives PO = Performance Objectives AO = Attitude Objectives	

PROPOSED PLAN FOR EVALUATING SIX HOE REGIONAL CONFERENCES

SPONSORED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The following proposed plan is an example of what can be done with available personnel.

This evaluation plan enables high level administrators to function on a high policy level.

Similarly, technical details are taken care of by technical staff.

Furthermore, tabulation can be accomplished by clerical staff.

No claim is made that the following proposed plan is perfect, but it is workable in the sense that clear cut and moderate objectives are specified. In addition, a timetable has been developed to monitor the step-by-step implementation of these desired objectives. At no time, have dreams been allowed to replace achievable and worthwhile accomplishments.

DRAFT

PROPOSED PLAN FOR

EVALUATING SIX HOE REGIONAL CONFERENCES

SPONSORED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGES

PERSONNEL INVOLVED:

1) Ruth Ellen Ostler, Chief, Bureau of Health Occupation Education

2) Mrs. R. Winnifred Johnson, Associate in Health Occupation Education, and Subject Specialist Consultant

3) Howard P. Alvir, Associate in Occupational Education Research and Continuing Consultant

EVALUATION MANDATE:

At the request of the BHOE Bureau Chief, the mandate of the evaluation plan is to:

1. Develop a form suitable for use in identifying the interest and needs of potential participants as a basis for program design. (This form is to be developed by the workshop directors with the consultation of the evaluation personnel.)

2. Consider appropriate conference evaluation procedures. (A distinction will be made between the task performed by the workshop directors and by the evaluation personnel.)

In accordance with the suggestions laid down by the BOER bureau chief, the following will be done:

1. Three independent groups will be sampled:

   Group I will consist of State Education Department Occupational Education personnel.

   Directors (Bielefeld, Post, Sutler)
   Chiefs
   Associates
   BISE personnel

Group II will consist of an independent sample of HOE teachers from high schools and BOCES' not participating in the six HOE regional workshops.

Part of group II will be drawn from schools.

Other parts of group II will be drawn from professional meetings.

Group III will consist of participants selected for the six HOE regional conferences.

2. Statistical analysis will be made to determine the levels of significance of the differential reactions of the above groups with regards to the following parameters of HOE inservice conferences:

   Objectives
   Evaluations
   Resources
   Process

3. Where possible, further statistical analysis and tests of significance will be made to pinpoint the differential responses according to the following teacher variables:

   Years of teaching HOE
   Years of work in health occupations
   Years of simultaneous HOE teaching and work in health occupations
   Academic degrees
   Certification

INSTRUMENTATION:

Eventually, three evaluation instruments will be developed:

1. An initial survey instrument (to be given before the workshop and to be used as a basis for program design).

2. An overall conference evaluation (to be given the last day of the conference as a final summation of participant opinion).

3. A followup questionnaire (to be given 6 months after the conference and in order to document benefits to learners).

TIMETABLE

The immediate objective of the evaluation design is to develop the initial survey form to be used as a basis for program design. The following timetable has been adopted:

February 5, 1975:	H.P. Alvir and R. W. Johnson develop an overall evaluation plan, this document.
February 21, 1975:	The six directors of the six regional conferences meet in Albany to develop the initial survey form and to agree upon evaluation procedures.
Before March 21, 1975:	H. P. Alvir and R. W. Johnson develop the necessary supplemental form to round out the evaluation form developed by the workshop directors.
Before May 2, 1975:	All workshop directors have tabulated and submitted the results of the initial survey form.
June 14, 1975:	Agreement is to be reached between evaluation personnel and the six conference directors as to the contents of the OVERALL CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM and the FOLLOWUP QUESTIONNAIRE.

DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES:

The evaluation personnel are available on a continuing consultation basis. It is presumed that this consultation will take place during the meeting held on February 21 and by telephone. At the present time, no provision is made for on site visitation to the six community colleges. It is the job of the evaluation team to:

1. Develop the supplemental evaluation forms.
2. Monitor the deadline for the workshop directors to submit tabulated data.
3. Compare the data submitted by all six conference directors by making the appropriate statistical tests of significance and group analyses.
4. Recommend essential program design elements that become evident during the statistical comparison of the six regional conferences.
5. Monitor all evaluation form developed in order to make sure that the evaluation traces the benefits of the six regional conferences to documented benefits to classroom students taught by participants of the regional workshops.

In other words, teachers will be the participants at the six regional conferences.

The focus of the evaluation is to make sure that the classroom students taught by conference participants derive documented benefits from these six regional conferences.

6. Sound out the agreements and disagreements of State Education occupational educators, the general population of school-based HOE educators, and HOE educators selected for participation in regional conferences.

   In cases where groups I, II, and III agree, the extent of this agreement is to be spelled out.

   In cases where groups I, II, and III disagree, the extent of this disagreement is to be tracked down.

   In certain cases, teacher characteristics can be correlated with certain agreements and disagreements. As far as the areas of agreement and disagreement are concerned two general areas of investigation emerge:

   The question of what is to happen to teachers at the six HOE regional conferences?

   What is to happen to classroom students taught be participating HOE teachers?

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONFERENCE DIRECTOR

The large number of responsibilities for the conference director have been listed in a more or less sequential approach. This means that the first item listed should be taken care of in the appropriate order.

In order to maximize effectiveness, it is possible to rearrange these day-by-day tasks into an overall perspective. The framework provided in the overall perspective is a recommendation and obviously can be further subdivided into individual tasks.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONFERENCE DIRECTOR

The director of the conference, workshop, program, or project will do the following:

Submit a letter of intent which specifies overall conference goals.

Submit a written proposal, at least 8 weeks before the conference begins, specifying objectives, evaluations, resources, content, and activities planned.

Submit a detailed budget by filling out form XYZ-ABC in which all costs are explained and justified.

File and retain for fiscal purposes the letter of allocation outlining the approved budget.

File and retain for fiscal purposes the official authorization which legally permits encumbering funds and recurring expenses.

Execute all administrator guidelines as specified in the official handbook.

Prepare the final report in the format required.

Submit requests for payments as scheduled. (With complete documentation).

Submit requests for 8% override on instructional costs as figures on the total budget excepts stipends. (Without need for documentation)

Set up a local fiscal account number to draw against as expenses are incurred.

Send out application blanks to all participants that specify:
(a) the applicant is certified
(b) the applicant is actually teaching
(c) the applicant is approved by the signature of the school superintendent

Submit stipend reimbursement only for amounts actually paid out, with a distinction made between overnight participants and commuters.

Make sure that fees are imposed equally upon all attendees and not only upon those publicly financed.

Make sure that consultants are kept in the limitations of fee maximums, travel maximums, and per diem expenses maximums.

Make sure that reimbursement to local staff is in line with actual salaries and costs incurred.

Make sure that the conference brochures specifies the funding under which the conference is sponsored.

Publish clearly all eligibility requirements for such things as graduate credit.

Enforce attendance requirements which distinguish between eligible and ineligible applicants.

Be ready for reallocation to receive more students if other conferences provide empty slots.

Set up a list of reasonable deadlines and "due" dates in order to insure enough room for the local staff to maneuver.

Develop, distribute, and tabulate the program preassessment form with all essential information.

Publicize the maximum permissible amounts for fees, travel, meals, and lodgings.

Rent all necessary equipment since purchase is forbidden.

Make sure that all materials distributed and expended fall in the category of permitted workbooks rather than in the category of textbooks.

Clarify the normal teaching load, overtime such as Saturday, Sunday, and evening, as well as preparation time at each institution.

OVERALL PERSPECTIVE

The preceding lists of responsibilities of the conference director is detailed. In order to provide a simplier framework within which to conceptualize the categorization of these responsibilities, the following list is provided.

1) Identify NEEDS of Occupational Education
   SKILLS of Higher Education institutions

2) Plan proposals, price, and approve the INTERVENTION

3) Publicize the STAFF DEVELOPMENT
   OPPORTUNITIES available

Looking at this threefold categorization will enable the conference director to keep track of a large number of important items without forgetting important priorities.

INSERVICE WORKSHOPS EVALUATION DESIGN

1. The workshop director is given three tasks:

   Development
   Approval
   Surveys

2. The professional evaluator is given three tasks:

   Analysis
   Correlation
   Sampling

3. Developing workshop plans means listing benefits in some type of priority order.

4. Approving evaluation instruments means listing each evaluation item sequentially in some type of a response order.

5. Analyzing each of the benefits listed and developed means making sure each benefit is appropriate, specific, measurable or accountable, and reasonable.

6. Correlating evaluation items and benefits means identifying which evaluation item measures each specific learner benefit.

7. Correlating the sample instrument with the workshop evaluation instrument means translating each evaluation item into at least four different parallel forms.

   Form 1: The teacher performs

   Form 2: The teacher is observed performing

   Form 3: The learner performs

   Form 4: The learner is observed performing

In addition, these different formats can be applied to the workshop director, the workshop staff, the supervisor or administrator of the workshop, the workshop participants, non-participants of the workshop, students taught by participants, and students taught by non-participants.

8. The sample results allow a benefit-by-benefit, evaluation item-by-evaluation item analysis of each item according to a wide variety of observational samples.

9. The sample evaluation possibilities point out a wide variety of methods and counts to be used in determining the success of the workshop.

10. In general, four different levels can be seen according to competency evaluation:

    Level I: The teacher acquires a new competency

    Level II: The teacher tries out the new competency in the school

    Level III: The teacher adapts the new competencies according to difficulties or obstacles encountered locally

    Level IV: The teacher documents learner benefits resulting from a newly acquired teacher competency

INSERVICE WORKSHOPS EVALUATION DESIGN

Spring - Summer 1975

Workshop Director does the following:	External Evaluator does the following:
1. Develops purposes, goals, objectives, benefits, processes, plans, products, or reasons for the workshop in concert with staff.	1. Analyzes workshop expectations to see if a. appropriate to inservice education b. specific c. measurable or countable d. reasonable
2. Approves an individualized evaluation instrument developed, revised, or selected by workshop staff as an acceptable yardstick of success (ie., measurable gains).	2. Correlates: a. each evaluation item with the prespecified expectations of the workshop b. each workshop expectation and evaluation item with a measurable learner benefit acceptable to the workshop director
3. Surveys: a. each staff member and participant with the approved evaluation instrument at least at the end of the workshop b. administrators, teachers, and students to measure impact upon classroom instruction and learning	3. Samples independently in October 1975 following workshop a. staff members and director b. supervisors or administrators c. workshop participants (classroom teachers) d. non-participants (classroom teachers) e. students (of participants) f. students (of non-participants)

DEVELOP WORKSHOP PLANS

Benefit A - - - - - - - - - - -

Benefit B - - - - - - - - - - -

Benefit C - - - - - - - - - - -

Benefit D - - - - - - - - - - -

Benefit E - - - - - - - - - - -

APPROVE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Item 1 - - - - - - - - - - -

2 - - - - - - - - - - -

3 - - - - - - - - - - -

4 - - - - - - - - - - -

5 - - - - - - - - - - -

6 - - - - - - - - - - -

7 - - - - - - - - - - -

8 - - - - - - - - - - -

9 - - - - - - - - - - -

10 - - - - - - - - - - -

11 - - - - - - - - - - -

12 - - - - - - - - - - -

ANALYZE BENEFITS

	Appropriate	Specific	Measurable or Countable	Reasonable
Benefit A	?	No	?	Yes
Benefit B	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Benefit C	Yes	?	No	?
Benefit D	No	Yes	Yes	No
Benefit E	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

CORRELATE EVALUATION ITEMS AND BENEFITS

Benefit A is measured by:

- Item 10
- Item 11

Benefit B is measured by:

- Item 1
- Item 5
- Item 9

Benefit C is measured by:

- Item 2

Benefit D is measured by:

- Item 3
- Item 7

Benefit E is measured by:

- Item 4
- Item 6
- Item 8
- Item 12

CORRELATE SAMPLING INSTRUMENT WITH WORKSHOP EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

CODING

Letter Code	Description	Evaluation Item
1	Teacher performs	Did you as a teacher perform competency 1?
1a	Teacher is observed performing	Did the teacher being observed perform competency 1?
1b	Learner performs	Did you as a student acquire success 1?
1c	Learner is observed performing	Did your students acquire success 1?

Workshop Instrument	Workshop Participant	FOLLOWUP PARALLEL SAMPLES						
		Work. Dir.	Workshop Staff	Supvrs or Admin.	Partici-pants	Non-Part.	Stud. of Part.	Stud. of Non-part.
Item 1	1	1a	1a	1a	1	1	1b	1b
Item 2	2	2c	2c	2c	2c	2c	2b	2b
Item 3	3	3a	3a	3a	3	3	3a	3a
Item 4	4	4c	4c	4c	4c	4c	4a	4a
Item 5	5	5a	5a	5a	5	5	5b	5b
Item 6	6	6c	6c	6c	6c	6c	6a	6a
Item 7	7	7a	7a	7a	7	7	7a	7a
Item 8	8	8c	8c	8c	8c	8c	8a	8a
Item 9	9	9a	9a	9a	9	9	9b	9b
Item 10	10	10a	10a	10a	10	10a	10b	10b
Item 11	11	11a	11a	11a	11	11a	11b	11b
Item 12	12	12c	12c	12c	12c	12c	12b	12b

SAMPLE RESULTS

Benefit Claimed	Evaluation	Wkshop Dir.	Wkshop Staff	Supvrs or Admin.	Parti-cipants	Non-Part.	Stud. of Part.	Stud. of Non-part.
A	Item 10	100%	75%	60%	50%	40%	30%	31%
	Item 11	0	0	40	50	10	70	10
B	Item 1	100	80	10	10	30	15	30
	Item 5	100	80	80	70	30	60	20
	Item 9	100	80	85	75	25	65	25
C	Item 2	100	50	55	55	40	52	51
D	Item 3	100	50	40	30	30	15	5
	Item 7	0	25	30	20	15	20	31
E	Item 4	0	0	10	20	10	30	10
	Item 6	100	80	70	80	40	70	30
	Item 8	0	60	70	90	30	80	20
	Item 12	100	80	70	80	40	70	20

ANALYSIS

Benefit A = ?
Benefit B = Yes
Benefit C = ?
Benefit D = No
Benefit E = Yes

SAMPLE EVALUATION POSSIBILITIES

Internal
External

Survey
Questionnaire
Teacher evaluation
Checklist
Observation
Anecdotal
Rating scales
State forms
Psychologist

Achievement pretesting
Achievement posttesting
Behavioral change

Count :
- # times service used
- # participants
- # using services
- # service units
- # phone inquiries
- # hours of service
- # spontaneous plaudits